



Committee on Student Promotions and Professional Standards

TO: Members, Committee on Student Promotions and Professional Standards

FROM: Nadine Katz, MD 
James David, MD 

DATE: May 17, 2004

RE: MEETING AGENDA

Sandeep Gupta

Sandeep, with his graduation date only two weeks away, has been on his Medicine sub-internship for the past six weeks, or so. Three days ago, Friday afternoon, the director for the sub phoned to say that Sandeep was to be relieved of any further duties or participation in this rotation. It was sketched out to me, by phone, that members of his clinical team were reporting difficulties with his reliability and his interpersonal "team skills" -- to the point of insisting that they no longer be required to work with him and to the point where this was interfering with the team's capacity to fulfill its duties.

More details were to follow, in time for today's Committee meeting. Attachments, including clerkship evaluations, are #1a-k.

Michael Tyberg

Michael's academic schematic is attachment #2a. His initial academic year, 2002-2003, entailed quite a number of failed exams. He declined to switch to part-time, at the time, and he explained that his grandmother had suffered a stroke -- on top of his living with his family of origin in Brooklyn. Late in the year, he came to the office breathlessly, having learned that his MCFM make-up exam was the next day (rather than a week away, as he had thought, as in attachment #2b). At that time, he seemed to appreciate that commuting from Brooklyn was jeopardizing his career prospects.

The current year, 2003-2004, Michael, by necessity, continued on a part-time schedule -- repeating the latter portion of MCFM. He failed Unit #5 for the second time, with attendance points hanging in the balance. Since a year ago, he has married, and continued living in Brooklyn in 03-04.

Norman Moore

4Name: **Michael Tyberg**Date of Matriculation: **August 2002**Date: **5/14/04****Year 1 - 2002/2003**

<u>Histology:</u> Exam 1 F 53.7 Final F 54.7 Make-up P 65	<u>Anatomy:</u> 1. Writ - 80.8, Pract - 68.8 - Pass 2. Writ - 71.1; Pract - 49.0 - Fail Unit #3 : 70 Final Grade: PASS	<u>CV Phys:</u> P 64.3	<u>Renal:</u> Exam 1 F 64 Exam 2 F 56.6 Final F 53.4 Make-up - P96
<u>MCFM:</u> 1. P 65.3 2. P 80.9 3. P 86.2 4. P 75.9 5. F 59.5 6. P 67.8 Final Average: 72.4 Make-up - F 64.4	<u>Dis Mech:</u> P 82.1	<u>Pharm:</u> Exam 1 P 69.4 Final P 89.2	
<u>ICM: Intro to Patient</u> PASS	<u>ICM: Clinical Experience</u> PASS	<u>Preventive Medicine:</u> PASS	

Exams Failed: 7

Year 2 - 2003/2004

<u>MCFM:</u> 4. P 72.6 5. F 64.9 6. P 88.1 m/u: 78.3 Final Average: 76.1	<u>Endocrine</u> 78.8	<u>Repro</u> 69.1	<u>CV Med</u> Dropped	<u>Pulmonary</u> Dropped (Conflict w/MCFM exam)	<u>GI/Liver</u> 79	<u>Hematology</u> m/u 5/14/04
--	--	------------------------------------	--	---	-------------------------------------	---

Exams Failed: 1

Year 3 - 200/2005

<u>CV Med</u>	<u>Pulmonary</u> Exam 1 Exam 2 Final	
<u>Nervous System/HB</u> Exam 1 Exam 2 Scantron Final	<u>Micro</u> Exam 1 Exam 2 Exam 3 Final	<u>Parasitology</u>
<u>ICM: Clinical Examination</u>	<u>Rheum</u>	

X-Authentication-Warning: webmail.aecom.yu.edu: nobody set sender to mtyberg@aecom.yu.edu using -f
Date: Thu, 1 May 2003 18:08:26 -0400
From: mtyberg@aecom.yu.edu
To: david@aecom.yu.edu, steinman@aecom.yu.edu
Subject: MCFM makeup exam
User-Agent: Internet Messaging Program (IMP) 3.1
X-Originating-IP: 129.98.45.220

ATTACHMENT
26

Hi, how are you? I hope that all is well with you.

This letter is regarding the makeup exam scheduled for May 2nd. Due to a misunderstanding on my part I was under the impression that the exam was scheduled for the 9th of May. I only became aware of the right time last night. It goes without saying that I am deeply perturbed about this situation as it means that it will effect my performance drastically on the exam. Please take this into account when you are evaluating my score. I am very sorry that this has happened and notwithstanding this unfotunate turn of events I am still giving my all into learning the material, as I always do. Thank you so much for understanding.

Sincerely,
Michael Tyberg

Committee on Student Promotions and Professional Standards

TO: Members, Committee on Student Promotions and Professional Standards

FROM: Nadine Katz, MD *NK*
James David, MD *JD*

DATE: May 30, 2004

RE: MEETING MINUTES – Meeting of May 17, 2004

Present: A Cajigas, C Cimino, J David, M Delgado, A Fleckman, P Grossman, M Gumbs, R Hays, N Katz (chair), S Lomonaco, P Ozuah, J Hoffman-Rosenfeld, J Rubenstein, N Soto, H Steinman, M Witt, and Y Auguste.

Absent: JA Betances, G Kenny, S Moghtaderi, S Martin, S Jacoby, W Kasoff, C Kinsey, J Neiger, T Vu

Excused: N Juthani

Dr. Katz called the meeting to order. The minutes of the April meeting were distributed, reviewed, and accepted.

☐ Norman Moore

At the April meeting, the Committee voted that Norman “decelerate” to a course schedule that was less than full-time. This would necessitate a period of more than two years in the basic science curriculum, as well as a later graduation date. Norman opted to appeal this decision at this May meeting. In his defense, he put forward his much improved exam performance during the interim weeks, as follows: Renal mid-term – 80. MCFM make-up – 78.3. CV exam – 72.1. Pharmacology mid-term – 68.1.

Norman read a statement and extemporized to the Committee members. He was asked if in his zeal to continue full-time he were aware of what was at stake should he fail further exams. Norman said, “...then I wouldn’t be here anymore.” The logic volleyed back and forth between Norman and some Committee members. In so many words, Norman said he, “...could handle it” – and members said it would be wiser to “...play it safer.” Norman stepped out (his written statement is appended to these minutes).

The discussion ended in a very close vote to uphold the prior deceleration decision. To this, several members expressed their strong suggestion that Norman enter psychotherapy. It was voted (10 to 0, with one abstention) to deputize Dr. David to try to persuade him to do so. This seemed more likely to enlist Norman’s cooperation, as compared to a direct Committee edict.

□ **Michael Tyberg**

Michael's academic record was distributed and reviewed; numerous exams were failed. He read a statement to the Committee, the thrust of which revolved around his family obligations and difficulties (grandmother's stroke). These were his reported mitigating factors in explaining and hopefully exonerating his poor record. His written statement is appended to these minutes.

Numerous incidents corresponded to different periods of exam failure. Committee members noted that Dr. David had under-counted the exam failures, making matters slightly worse.

The Committee, sympathetic up to a point, took a position of not accepting this extended pattern of exam failures. Several Committee members voiced the principle that personal responsibilities (to family, to spouse), would be increasing in the coming years – not decreasing. And that we all face the challenge of meeting our professional obligations despite our personal travails.

The Committee voted 8 to 3 to withdraw Michael from the medical school program. An appeal is anticipated.

□ **Vanessa Hinckson**

Vanessa, largely due to accumulated exam failures, had been provisionally withdrawn from the program at the April 19th Committee meeting. She comes to this May meeting to appeal. She read a statement to the Committee (appended to these minutes), asking to be allowed to continue in the curriculum. Interim performance showed improvement. After reviewing the full record and hearing from Vanessa, the Committee voted 9 to 1 to rescind the prior recommendation for withdrawal.

□ **Sandeep Gupta**

Sandeep, due to local reports provoking major concerns as to his professionalism, had been discontinued from his Medicine subinternship duties. As per the by-laws, this constitutes a "failing" performance in a clinical graduation requirement.

In addition to a high degree of interpersonal friction, alarming statements, made in anger, were allegedly attributed to Sandeep. He addressed the Committee (written statement appended to these minutes), but more information was needed to properly assess and address this matter.

In full recognition of the potentially distorting effects of an impending graduation and internship – the Committee voted to suspend Sandeep from clinical duties until such time as an ad-hoc subcommittee could investigate matters and establish if it were safe for Sandeep to resume. Furthermore, until the subinternship requirement was accomplished, Sandeep would not be eligible to graduate. The full Committee would hear from the subcommittee in June. In the interim, provisional decisions that could not properly wait would be taken as needed by the subcommittee – submitted later for full Committee review/revision.

□ **Jeevan Padiyar**

The Committee was distributed a summary of the circumstances and copies of correspondence surrounding this “disciplinary consultation” for the Sue Golding Graduate Division. The applicable by-law was familiar to most members. The page-long summary of events included Jeevan’s suspension from the BSL-3. Short on time, the matter was to be investigated further via the ad-hoc subcommittee process, and would be followed further at the full Committee’s June meeting.

□ **Robert Chang**

Discussion of Robert’s circumstances was postponed to the June 7th full Committee meeting.

JD/mnd